

**REMARKS**

**I. Interview Summary**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the helpful and courteous interview conducted on August 5, 2010. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is discussed herein. During the interview, Applicants' representatives and the Examiner discussed the evidence of unexpected results previously presented by Applicants.

**II. The Rejection Based on Kameyama et al. in view of Tanaka et al. and Sugino et al.**

Claims 1-7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kameyama et al. (WO 2004/013667) in view of Tanaka et al. ('906) and Sugino et al. (US 2003/0137732). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

During the August 5, 2010 interview, Applicants' representatives and the Examiner carefully reviewed the experimental procedures of the inventive examples and the comparative examples previously presented. It was noted that:

1. The first swelling bath for Example 1 examples had a draw ratio of 2.7 total (a draw ratio in the first swelling bath of 2 and a draw ratio in the first swelling bath of 1.35); and
2. The additional examples and comparative examples appeared to indicate that the draw ratios were the same as in Example 1.

With regards to the second note, Applicants hold that the draw ratios of the additional examples and comparative examples were the same as in Example 1.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of their evidence of unexpected results. Moreover, Applicants note that the Examiner acknowledges that the presently claimed method achieves unexpected results, *i.e.*, “**unexpected results are obtained** since the stretch ratio is unchanged but low color irregularities are achieved.” See Interview Summary.

The unexpected results obtained may be based on the draw ratios being the same in Example 1 and the additional examples and comparative examples. For additional evidence see Example 4, and Comparative Examples 4 and 7 of the present specification.

For the Examiner’s convenience, Applicants herein reproduce their arguments and evidence of unexpected results achieved by the presently claimed method.

For example, if Example 4 and Comparative Example 7 of the present specification are compared with each other, the bath temperatures of the first swelling bath and the second swelling bath are merely inverted (the bath temperature of the first swelling bath is 35°C and the bath temperature of the second swelling bath is 30°C in Example 4, and the bath temperature of the first swelling bath is 30°C and the bath temperature of the second swelling bath is 35°C in Comparative Example 7). However, polarizing films having low color irregularities can be obtained in Example 4, while color irregularities of dyeing occur in polarizing films of Comparative Example 7. This result is not expected from the disclosures of Kameyama, Tanaka and Sugino. In other words, the above-mentioned result is unexpected from the teachings that the bath temperature of each of the plural swelling baths is set at a low temperature in order to lower the stretch ratio, thereby reducing the dyeing unevenness.

Also, if Example 4 and Comparative Example 4 of the present specification are compared with each other, the bath temperature of the second swelling bath is identical, while the bath temperature of the first swelling bath in Example 4 is higher than the bath temperature of the first swelling bath in Comparative Example 4 (the bath temperature of the first swelling bath is 35°C and the bath temperature of the second swelling bath is 30°C in Example 4, and the bath temperature of the first swelling bath is 30°C and the bath temperature of the second swelling bath is 30°C in Comparative Example 4). However, polarizing films having low color irregularities can be obtained in Example 4, while color irregularities of dyeing occur in polarizing films of Comparative Example 4. This result is not expected from the disclosures of Kameyama, Tanaka and Sugino. In other words, the above-mentioned result is unexpected from the teachings that the bath temperature of each of the plural swelling baths is set at a low temperature in order to lower the stretch ratio, thereby reducing the dyeing unevenness.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 1-7 and 13 is not rendered obvious from the disclosures of Kameyama et al, Tanaka et al and Sugino et al and it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that their claimed invention is allowable and ask that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully solicited.

If any points remain at issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local exchange number listed below.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

/BERNADETTE K. MCGANN/

Bernadette K. McGann  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 65,127  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

LCW/BKM/af